

OK for those councilors who just voted against the bonding for the energy project that would have saved the city money, and then within minutes vote to accept a bid for a contract that is \$30,000 more than the lowest bidder? The hypocrisy here is even greater. Because of the relatively brief discussion on the pavement issue I can't help thinking that it was approved based on the amount of comments spoken during public forum. There are times when that's not a problem, but can we afford this practice at this time? Councilor Scott is continually reminding us of the current economic turmoil and how important it is to limit spending, but without hesitation had absolutely no problem voting to burden our budget with the additional \$30,000. And to add insult to injury there was absolutely no indication during the energy bonding issue that any consideration was given to the comments we heard on this matter during public forum. In my mind that's hypocrisy. Several weeks ago those who watch the council were treated with arguments on why there needs to be a change in council rules to allow residents to speak at all meetings so the council can hear what the people have to say. After way too much discussion on a matter that probably won't matter one iota to anyone, a rule change was accepted. My personal opinion for asking for the rule change is to give the "three regulars" who do nothing but bad mouth the city manager and mayor more chances to be on TV. I bring this up as another example of hypocrisy. You say you want more input from the public on issues for consideration in your decisions. Well I saw no evidence of that during the discussion for the energy bonding issue, but I will admit you did that when making a decision to burden the budget with an additional \$30,000. Am I to expect similar "selective consideration" in the future?

I was against the tax cap initiative, but now I can see a good side. No matter how many bad decisions the council makes, my tax bill will only increase by the annual CPI. The passage or failure of the two issues I've addressed wouldn't have affected my tax bill one iota. What it has done is caused the city to lose more than a quarter million dollars of state aid that would have been used to offset some of the bonding cost of the energy project, add to the retirement package that Mr. Peschel will ultimately receive when he leaves/retires, and causes the city manager to again change the budget in an attempt to compensate for the savings to the city that will now be lost because of the defeat of these two issues. I'm sure glad you're working for my best interest. I'd hate to see what you'd do if you weren't.

I would appreciate it if someone would make copies of this e-mail and give to Councilors Scott and Callaghan at the next meeting. Thank you.

*Dick Lowell*

aredel@comcast.net

Council members,

I've watched city council meetings for the last several years and the meeting I watched on the evening of April 22 clearly demonstrates that the continuous efforts of Councilors Scott, Callaghan and Cheney to employ every possible tactic to stall every issue in an attempt to defeat it, no matter how beneficial to the citizens of Dover, are beginning to weigh heavy on the shoulders of those who are trying to make Dover a better place to live. Their efforts have failed in the past because the majority of councilors evaluate issues on their merits, and vote accordingly. Unfortunately the tide seems to be changing, because this group has found a new friend.

Councilor Weston's unwillingness to vote on Mr. Peschel's employment agreement and the bonding for the energy project has provided just what Councilors Scott, Callaghan and Cheney needed to defeat these two issues. I will add that I don't really believe she did it for the same reasons, but nevertheless the result was the same. Weston was visibly upset during the meeting when she felt she was being singled out as the one to blame if the energy efficiency project were to fail. Well, Councilor Weston, I, for one consider your unwillingness to cast a vote based on the information you already had to be the reason not only for the defeat of the energy project, but also to a major factor in Mr. Peschel's decision to withdraw his name from consideration. Your actions will undoubtedly cost this city money.

Councilor Weston said that she could go either way on the energy bonding issue, but if forced to vote on it at his meeting she could not support it because she hadn't yet received additional information she had requested from other sources. My question to Councilor Weston is if you didn't have any reason to vote against it now, why are you looking for additional input? One thing you could have done is weigh the good things you found in the report against the things you could not support and base your vote on the results? There were only two types of information that you could have received; it would be either favorable or unfavorable. The \$25,000 report we paid for contained an enormous amount of favorable information, so one can only wonder if what you were hoping for something unfavorable you could use to help defend a "no" vote which, if you were listening to those who spoke in favor of the project at the public forum, would be an unpopular one. If the information you've been studying for the past several months hadn't convinced you that this was a bad deal than why are you looking for info that might? With the lack of any negative information to support a no vote at the time at his time why wouldn't you vote the will of the people? I'm hoping that we're not seeing the birth of a new tactic. One in which a councilor is attempting to hide their true position on an issue arguing that they are unable to support it at this time because the council won't give them additional time to study it, knowing it will ultimately result in the defeat of the issue. This is not an accusation, but something I think is not unreasonable for councilors to consider in future deliberations.

No one, including me, would criticize anyone on the council for wanting to get as much information as possible before deciding an issue. There is a defined point in the process outlined in the city charter when the council is expected to vote on an issue. I don't think it's unreasonable to expect our elected officials to be able to cast a responsible vote at that time. To hold the citizens of this city hostage until you get additional information that may or may not come, and could contain information that may or may not be assessable to the public is a bad practice. It continues to amaze me that some on the

council have few qualms about committing our tax dollars to hire professionals to provide them with technical expertise on an issue they have little or no knowledge of, and then spend months micromanaging and questioning the recommendations only to vote the project down "because they need more info."

Now we have the "but" factor. Whenever a councilor is opposed to an issue, they preface their remarks by saying something like how much they respect a person, or how much they appreciate the work of others, or that they are in favor of a program, and then comes the much anticipated and always expected "but. . . ." Those who continually use this tactic defend this action by saying they need another report from the city manager, or more information from an "outside" source, or that they need more time to study the issue. After watching council meetings for the past several years it's my belief that in addition to using this as a stall tactic prior to voting no on the issue, it is also used in an attempt to troll for information from "outside" sources in hopes of getting data/information they can use to challenge an answer/ruling they've received from the city attorney or the city manager in response to a question they asked and didn't support their position on an issue. It amazes me that there are some on the council who feel they know more about the law than the city attorney, or more about the state and county requirements that must be followed when running a city than the city manager. I've come to expect this from Councilors Scott, Callaghan and Cheney, who routinely do this in their attempt to stifle any proposal that has any financial responsibilities associated with it, but I am extremely disappointed that Councilor Weston is now doing the same thing. I will add that it's not a bad thing to question the spending of taxpayer's money. However, there are some on the council who are unwilling to differentiate between value and cost. Now let's talk about hypocrisy.

Councilor Callaghan was one of the harshest critics of the retirement package paid to the former Chief of Police but continues to block the efforts of the city manager to prevent this from happening again. He opposed a recommended employee agreement with Mr. Peschel that would have saved the city money, and on April 8<sup>th</sup> he was the only council member who would not support Councilor DeDe's request for council support for a letter he was preparing to send to the newspapers of local and surrounding communities. The letter was asking people to write their state representative and asking them to support HB 532. This bill was written to solve a key cause of excessive retirement benefits by eliminating special pay and/or overtime in the calculation of a New Hampshire State Retiree's pension, and is the reason our former Chief of Police was able to retire with a pension that was substantially higher than his last year of pay. I must be fair to Councilor Callaghan and tell him that I've also considered his action might not have been born out of hypocrisy, but rather based solely on his hatred for Councilor DeDe, and as such warrants continued opposition to anything Councilor DeDe might propose no matter how it might benefit the citizens of this community. If this was the case councilor than I'm obligated to add another character trait to your resume: Disgraceful!

There are other examples of hypocrisy within the council. I was amazed that those who voted against the energy project because of some imaginary unknown cost to the taxpayers didn't hesitate one minute to accept a bid on a pavement project that will burden the city budget with an additional \$30,000 dollars because the lowest bidder didn't provide a document that some felt should have been provided at the time of bidding even though it was not a mandatory requirement. My question here is: why was it